

10/797,550

663-004us

**REMARKS**

This paper is responsive to an Official Action that issued in this case on January 13, 2006. In that Action, the Office:


- Rejected claims 43-46, 70, 71, and 74 under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 3,667,679 to Wiesenberg;
- Objected to claims 62-69, 72, and 73 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim; and
- Allowed claims 75-93.

Applicant's attorney wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesy of a telephonic interview (January 23, 2006) to discuss the case. During the interview, Applicant proposed an amendment to claim 43 to overcome the rejection over Wiesenberg. Since all rejected claims are dependent on claim 43, overcoming the rejection of this claim places the case in condition for allowance. The Examiner agreed that the proposed amendment did appear to distinguish the Wiesenberg reference, but wished to withhold final judgment pending further consideration.

For the Examiner's convenience, the relevant portion of the Wiesenberg reference is Figure 6. In particular, the Examiner's attention is drawn to the fact that in Wiesenberg's nozzle, the bulk of the gas flows in an axial direction through the gas aperture and in a radial direction through the nozzle (84). (The aperture is unnumbered in Wiesenberg, but is assumed to lead from the large conduit (72) to small conduit (82).) This arrangement is the opposite of what is recited in amended claim 43, wherein the bulk of the flow of gas through the gas aperture (662) is in the radial direction and the bulk of the flow of gas through the nozzle (672) is in the axial direction.

If any issues remain prior to allowance of the case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned for prompt resolution.

Respectfully,

By   
Wayne S. Breyer  
Reg. No. 38,089  
732-578-0103 x12

24 January 2006

DeMont & Breyer, L.L.C.  
Suite 250, 100 Commons Way  
Holmdel, NJ 07733